

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,037	07/11/2003	Jonathan B. Ballagh	X-1208 US	4137
24309 7	590 04/21/2006		EXAMINER	
XILINX, INC			BOWERS, E	BRANDON
	L DEPARTMENT		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2100 LOGIC I)R		71.07.07.07	
SAN JOSE, C	A 95124		2825	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			H4			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	•			
	10/618,037	BALLAGH ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Brandon W. Bowers	2825				
The MAILING DATE of this communicatio Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory in Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re ion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed "HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	02 February 2006.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for al	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice un	nder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the applic	ation.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wit	thdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 July 2003</u> is/ard	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊟ object	ed to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection t	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the o	correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by t	he Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B	iments have been received. iments have been received in Ap e priority documents have been i	oplication No				
* See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified copies not r	eceived.				
Attachment(s) 1) \(\sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Su	ummary (PTO-413)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-032) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/5 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	48) Paper No(s))/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2825

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: The use of the word "for" in describing what actions the different sections perform renders the claim indefinite. It is unclear if the action is performed or not by the section. Changing to "an input section that provides" for example will overcome this objection. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bening, US Patent No. 6,684,381.

In reference to claims 1, 6, 11, 13, 15, 18, and 21-23, Bening teaches a method/apparatus/system that performs the steps of identifying an implicit circuit description representing behavior of a first portion of circuit elements within an electronic design, augmenting explicit circuit descriptions representing behavior of a second portion of circuit elements within the electronic design with addition circuit

Art Unit: 2825

information, and translating the electronic design into a circuit description language representation (Column 10, line 40 – column 12, line 63).

In reference to claims 7, 12, 14, 16, and 19, Bening teaches identifying a connection among the implicit circuit description and at least one of the explicit circuit descriptions, adding ports to the implicit circuit description and the at least one of the explicit circuit descriptions responsive to the connection and associating an identifier with the ports added (Column 10, line 40 – column 12, line 63).

In reference to claims 3, 8, 17, and 20, Bening teaches locating two ports to be connected within the electronic design database based on the identifier, and adding constructs to the circuit description language representation to effect the connection among the two ports (Column 10, line 40 – column 12, line 63).

In reference to claims 4, 5, and 9, Bening teaches wherein the explicit circuit descriptions and the implicit circuit description are organized over levels of hierarchy within the electronic design and wherein the connections span a plurality of the levels of hierarchy (Column 10, line 40 – column 12, line 63).

In reference to claims 2 and 10, Bening teaches performing the steps of identifying and augmenting for the entire circuit (Column 10, line 40 - column 12, line 63).

Art Unit: 2825

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2 February 2006, with respect to the Filseth and Wikle references have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of the claims by these references has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the Bening reference and the claims objections been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Bening does not teach translating an electronic design of an integrated circuit into a circuit description language. Bening does teach translating an electronic design of an integrated circuit into a circuit description language (column 3, lines 18-19). In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., translation between different circuit representations) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). With respect to the objection to claim 18, the MPEP states:

Art Unit: 2825

The subject matter of a properly construed claim is defined by the terms that limit its scope. It is this subject matter that must be examined. As a general matter, the grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits the claim scope. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. The following are examples of language that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim:

- (A) statements of intended use or field of use,
- (B) "adapted to" or "adapted for" clauses,
- (C) "wherein" clauses, or
- (D) "whereby" clauses.

As such, the intended use sections that follow the "for"s in claim 18 is not limiting of the claims and therefore the only patentable sections of claim 18 are a system comprising an input section, an augmentations section, and a translation section. Without any context on how these sections are related to one another or perform within the system, this claim is indefinite.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2825

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Page 6

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon W. Bowers whose telephone number is (571)272-1888. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am until 5:00 pm Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith can be reached on (571)272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BWB